UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Messages to the Pope and the President

By SYDNEY STRONG

Tyranny in Italy

By DOROTHY WALTON

War, International Policing, and Disarmament

A Correspondence between

CHARLES W. ELIOT and HENRY W. PINKHAM

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART XII

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 21

Chicago, February 2, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
DAVID STARR JORDAN
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL — Page
Notes 323
Messages to the Pope and the President—SYDNEY STRONG 325
Jottings—J. H. H. 327
ARTICLES—
A Creed for Liberals—RABBI ABBA HILLEL SILVER 323
Tyranny in Italy—DOROTHY WALTON 328
War, International Policing, and Disarmament—Correspondence Between the Late CHARLES W. ELIOT and HENRY W. PINKHAM 329
Thoughts of Tolstoy—*Part XII* 333
POETRY—
Trumpets on New Horizons: Tramps—GRACE STONE COATES 332
The Merry-Go-Round—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 332
Civilization—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 332
Hard Winter—PHYLLIS B. MORDEN 335
THE STUDY TABLE—
Unemployment—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 334
Rebel Poets—LUCIA TRENT 334
CORRESPONDENCE—
God and Civilization—JOHN T. RICKETT 335
True But Not the Whole Truth—ALICE HENRY 335
Equal Freedom—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW 335
THE FIELD—
India's Declaration of Independence 322
Educators Denounce Increase in Lynchings 336
A New Co-operative Settlement—*The War Resister* 336

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

India's Declaration of Independence

On January 26th, celebrations of the first anniversary of India's independence were held in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and other places in America. For the benefit of our readers, we publish herewith India's Declaration of Independence which was read and proclaimed on this date. Copies of this Declaration, handsomely printed for posting in churches, schools, clubs, etc., may be obtained from Mr. Haridas Muzumdar, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.—Editor.

India's Declaration of Independence

January Twenty-sixth, Nineteen Hundred and Thirty

"We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or to abolish it. The British government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally and spiritually. We believe, therefore, that India must sever the British connection and attain Purna Swaraj, or complete independence.

"India has been ruined economically. The revenue derived from our people is out of all proportion to our income. Our average income is 7 pice (less than 5 cents) per day, and of the heavy taxes we pay, 20 per cent are raised from the land revenue derived from the peasantry, and 3 per cent from the salt tax which falls most heavily on the poor.

"Village industries, such as hand-spinning, have been destroyed, leaving the peasantry idle for at least four months in the year, and dulling their intellect for want of handicrafts, and nothing has been substituted, as in other countries, for the crafts thus destroyed.

"Customs and currency have been so manipulated as to heap further burdens on the peasantry. The British manufactured goods constitute the bulk of our imports. Customs duties betray clear partiality for British manufactures, and revenue from them is used not to lessen the burden on the masses but for sustaining a highly extravagant administration. Still more arbitrary has been the manipulation of the exchange ratio, which has resulted in millions being drained away from the country.

"Politically, India's status has never been so reduced as under the British regime. No reforms have given real political power to the people. The tallest of us have to bend before foreign authority. The rights of free expression of opinion and free association have been denied to us, and many of our countrymen are compelled to

(*Continued on Page* 336)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1931 NUMBER 21

A CREED FOR LIBERALS

We believe in Man, in his slow, ascendant progress, in the autonomy of his spirit and in the primacy of his claims over the claims of all forms of human organization.

We believe in freedom—the fullest measure of freedom compatible with the fullest measure of responsibility.

We believe in authority—but only in authority sanctioned by reason and consent.

We believe that the only tools of social progress are education, experimentation and cooperation.

We believe that to be well-governed is not as important as to be self-governed; that values bestowed are not as desirable as values achieved. Hence, we reject all manner of millenniums proffered to us at the spearpoint of dictatorship.

We believe that all truth is made manifest through the contact and clash of diverse opinions and that the very motive power of progress is the free exchange of ideas and the exercised privilege of non-conformity.

We believe in tolerance but not in indifference, in enthusiasm but not in fanaticism, in convictions but not in obsessions, in independence but not in isolation, in conflict but not in hate.

—*Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver,*
in "Religion in a Changing World."

On December 15th last, UNITY stated, in anticipation of the Wickersham report, that we saw no reason for getting excited about it. Whatever this report may be, we said,

> . . . . it will make no more impression upon the present situation than a drop of water falling on a red-hot stove. There will be a sound, as of something explosive, then the report, like the drop of water, will be gone, and the red-hot stove of conflicting opinion will blaze on. The Wickersham report, in other words, is a matter of just exactly no importance whatsoever.

In all that has happened since the famous report was published on January 20th last, we find abundant confirmation of our prognostication. Never have we been a sounder prophet. Reactions on the report are determined precisely by previous conviction and opinion. If you are "wet," you will agree with the Charleston *News and Courier* that "the report is a staggering blow to national Prohibition." If, on the contrary, you are "dry," you will agree with the Lincoln *State Journal* that "the report contains little comfort for the 'wets'," or with the Denver *Post* that "the report . . . is as bone-dry as the Eighteenth Amendment itself." Of course, the Commission is itself largely responsible for this perfectly ludicrous divergence of opinion, for, after writing a report which, as Senator Borah declared, is "very satisfactory to the supporters of the Eighteenth Amendment," it proceeded to torpedo this report by publishing the utterly unimportant because obviously uncertain and unfounded personal opinions of its members. It is as though the Supreme Court should say in a case—the evidence makes it necessary for us to decide thus and so, but we don't like it a little bit. Inevitably, it is the official judgment that counts in this instance, as in every such instance. Hence the "drys" may well feel perfectly satisfied. *They have won the verdict.* None the less, the verdict remains of little effect. Everybody is going on thinking exactly what he thought before. The drop of water has fallen on the red-hot stove—and there's the stove still blazing!

Anybody who so desires is free to get what comfort he can out of the report of the India Round Table Conference. More has come out of it than was expected, thanks to the unremitting pressure of Gandhi and the Nationalists at home. If anything is finally accomplished, thanks will be due neither to Englishmen nor to Indians in London, but to the sixty-odd thousand heroic Indian leaders who went to jail with the sympathy and support of unnumbered millions of their fellow-countrymen. But whatever chance there was of accomplishment, was forfeited, to our mind, when Premier MacDonald failed to open the prison doors in India at the time he proclaimed the new constitution in England. What a chance he had to make a magnificent gesture of magnanimous good-will, and at the same time an eloquent bid for the support of Nationalist opinion! Suppose that Mr. MacDonald had stood up before the world and said, "We have achieved more at this Round Table than any of us in the beginning had dared to hope. We have agreed upon a constitution granting a large measure of self-government in India, which we at this Table think ought to be accepted. In token of our confidence in our own work, and in expression of our confidence in the people of India, we release all political offenders in our jails, and ask the Nationalists to meet with us in laying the foundations of an independent India." What would have happened, had this gesture been made, we do not know. The Indian patriots might well fear the Britains bearing gifts! But that such a gesture would have im-

measurably strengthened MacDonald's position, and given the only pledge that can be given of his sincerity, goes without saying. As it is, the whole issue is thrown back to the Nationalists, and to Gandhi. Not in England but in India, this question is going to be settled. Today, as from the beginning, the Mahatma is the sole arbiter of his people's destiny. And the Mahatma still lies behind the bars of Yeravda jail! What hope is there of any favorable outcome so long as this situation continues?

Critical times in the foreign markets! What's happening to America in the matter of foreign trade? For years our American business men have been triumphantly pushing their raw materials and manufactured products abroad, and step by step driving competitors to flight or ruin. We have pursued England with special delight, beating her in port after port by the happy device of slashing prices and thus underselling her. Our tariff at home (all for the benefit of the consumer, remember!) has enabled our manufacturers and merchants to boost domestic prices so high and thus make such enormous profits in the home markets, that they could dump their surplus in foreign markets at any old price and thus outbid everybody else in sight. Oh, it has been a grand old game—exploiting buyers at home, ruining sellers abroad! But now, all of a sudden, something has happened. A competitor has appeared in foreign markets who is doing unto us what we have been doing unto others. Russia, Soviet Russia, Communist Russia, is entering markets which we captured long ago, and is taking them away from us, as we took them away some years past from England. An American honey merchant returns from abroad and reports that he has not sold a pound of his delicious product—Russia has taken all his business! American timber men on the Pacific seaboard are watching idle saw mills—Russia has taken over all the timber trade of the Orient! American wheat, what's the matter with it? A lot of things—among others, Russian wheat underselling American wheat in foreign countries! And all this is just a faint beginning of what is going to descend upon us like a flood in the next ten years. Russia is ruining our foreign trade exactly as we have been ruining England's. It was a great game when we were doing the killing. Curiously enough, we don't like it now that we are being killed. But we can't object. For Communist Russia is acting in the very best capitalistic tradition.

The Red Cross drive for $10,000,000, duly sanctioned by the United States government, is an event abundantly worth thinking about. It is some time since we have had to raise money like this for the starving millions of our own land. The starving in Russia, the starving of China—these are more or less familiar. But to have the scene of misery suddenly transferred to this country is something else again. What does it mean that hunger should be stalking the city streets and village by-ways of America? Are our people breeding so fast that production cannot keep pace with population? No, there was no unusual or disproportionate increase uncovered by last year's census. Has some widespread drought or disease blighted the nation's crops? No, our barns are bursting with grain so abundant that no market can be found for it at a favorable price, though in Arkansas and elsewhere there are local areas where last summer's lack of rainfall worked disaster. Has transportation broken down, so as to prevent movements of food? Again, no—our railroads are open and crying out for freight to fill their empty cars. Well, what *is* the matter? In a country not overpopulated, rich with harvests, spanned with highways, glutted with money, why should millions of men and women be face to face with starvation? Who knows? Where is the answer to the question, except in the indictment of a system of industry and finance which wrecks its own prosperity and brings disaster upon its own head? We note a growing tendency to blame our business men and bankers and politicians. And they deserve blame, also ridicule and denunciation, if only for their silly refusal to recognize a situation, and their deliberate endeavor still to fool the people that the depression is over and the upward trend begun. But the trouble is not with men, save as they are smug and greedy; it is with a system which was never designed to feed mouths, but only to make profits out of their hunger. Some time we are going to reorganize industry to the end of the common service of the good. Then starvation will disappear from a land that should never have known it.

The modification of the Jones "five and ten" law for Prohibition enforcement is another (see UNITY, January 12th) beautiful illustration of the futility of severe punishment as a method of securing obedience to law. It was when liquor violations were at their worst, which was yesterday, by the way, and not today, that Senator Jones had the happy thought of piling on the penalties and therewith frightening all the bootleggers and their patrons out of business. This was shortly after Senator Baumes in the New York legislature had the same kind of happy thought, and secured the passage of the laws which first disgraced his name and then, by their silly failure, made his name ridiculous. Why Senator Jones, or his Baumes rival, did not resort outright to thumbscrews, and racks, and boiling in oil, and the rest, the anxious world may never know. Perhaps he thought that one might get too much even of the best of things. However this may be, the redoubtable Senator hit on the idea of imposing sentence of five years in prison or ten thousand dollars fine, or both, for offenses against Prohibition hitherto regarded as not over-serious. The law, duly passed,

proceeded at once to make a fool of itself, of Prohibition, of the senators who enacted it, and of the officers who were trying to enforce it. Juries, as usual, refused to convict, judges to impose sentence, and officers even to arrest, and everything fell into confusion worse confounded. One of the first things that the Wickersham Commission saw was that the Jones law was impossible, and that it should be repealed or modified. Now a very moderate change has been made. Other more thorough going alleviations must follow. Meanwhile, humanity has once again been taught that cruelty never works. But how long will the lesson stand? Until the next outbreak of crime—the next visitation of panic! Then force and violence will be tried again—and fail again. So 'round and 'round we go, till the head grows dizzy! But—the 'round and 'round is a spiral. We *do* move slowly upward!

In these times of depression and despair, it is well to have something that we can laugh at. Representative Hamilton Fish's report on Communistic activities in the United States is thus timely and valuable. The gayety of nations is at a low ebb these days, and Mr. Fish and his colleagues have added to it at a moment when it sorely needs assistance. It's some time since we have laughed a good, deep, rumbling, diaphragmic laugh, but we laughed just this kind of a laugh when we opened our newspaper and read this ponderous report. For could anything be funnier than the sober spectacle of these frightened Congressmen poking 'round in the dark corners of the nation, snooping under beds and into closets, looking in an exquisite agony of terror for these "red" burglars from Moscow? These investigators have jumped at every mouse's squeak, gasped at every flitting shadow, screamed at every creaking stair. And now they come with their hysterical report that our country is infested and our property in dire peril! That anybody will take this report seriously is not to be believed. The wave of merriment began rolling up very promptly after its publication, and now is sweeping the nation like a flood. Only in Russia, we imagine, will the words of Mr. Fish be received as though they really meant something. There, in the conclaves of the Soviets, will the silly statements of this Congressional committee be taken as sure evidence that Communism is advancing in America, and thus be everywhere spread abroad for the enlightenment and encouragement of the Bolsheviki. As usual in matters of this kind, ignorant and solemn big-wigs have given aid and comfort to those whom they fear, and helped on the very movement which they would destroy. But, even so, Communism in this country, as a threat to our institutions, is a joke. As one not particularly enthusiastic over these institutions, we wish it were something a bit more serious. Then there might be some hope of getting a few reforms.

Messages to the Pope and the President

We are moved to address a message to the Pope and one to the President. They are both given to sending forth messages to the world containing advice. It must be lonesome to get little back in return. This is an effort to help them, by way of sending a message to them. To be sure, their messages are broadcasted over the earth. However, we are reminded that UNITY goes into over thirty lands, and take courage, especially when we are convinced that our words are about more weighty matters than usually issue from the Vatican and the White House.

My first message is—it comes rolling up out of the mind and heart of mankind—

To the Pope

Abolish War! If you would command your adherents not to take arms war would cease. You took 16,000 words to free your mind on the subject of one phase of family life. A sixteen-word order—if you meant it—would abolish war. What does a discussion of marriage amount to, when the holacaust of war-hell may be in the making to scourge the earth?

We would not be unmindful of your long message on the family. We do not find ourselves much in disagreement with what you say about the family, except your assumption of authority. We would say, however, that you are about the last person on earth we would select to give a lecture on marriage. You do not know what is going on in the world. You have never traveled, never mingled among men. You would not enjoy the companionship of a carpenter, or tent-maker, or fisherman, as plain brother-man. Those in authority neither know men, nor are known by men. What can a celibate know about marriage? His views must be theoretical and traditional. The findings of a conference of ten clean-living husbands and wives on marriage would be far more sane and valuable than the findings of the whole college of Cardinals. What do Cardinals know about marriage and the family-life?

Your views on marriage are not exacting enough for us, for we have enjoyed 300 years sacred benefits of New England ancestry, with Puritan ideas of God, family, marriage. As a young Puritan, 25 years old, we traveled through France, Italy, on to Egypt and Palestine—and were constantly grateful for a Puritan home, with family worship (the father as priest), no thought of divorce, with God as supreme

authority. In no land—Australia, Mexico, England, Japan, Russia—have we found the family life more exalted and protected than the Puritan family-life of New England,—even in those lands that are most completely under your authority. We would place the Puritan home above your ideals.

You say, "the family is more sacred than the *State.*" We heartily agree to that, and are therefore opposed to conscription. We would go farther and say, the family is more sacred than the *Church!* We would ask you to step up higher in your conception of the family, i. e., take the Puritan conception of the family, which gives peculiar honor to marriage by declining to put the stamp of sacredness upon celibacy, a conception which makes the family altar the most sacred meeting-place with God, and the father as his representative. By no one is the family more highly exalted than by the Puritan.

Turning now from the problem of marriage—discussion of which in 16,000 word documents, when the world is burning up, is to add confusion, and accomplish little. We call upon you *to abolish war.* Here is something you can do. Major-General Everson is right. Soldiers are not to blame for war. The Church, he says, is to blame, because the Church could stop it. Of course, the Anglicans are to blame. The Methodists are to blame, also. Many Methodists are getting to feel conscience-stricken over the situation, and you may wake up some morning and find the Methodists leading the way to war's abolition. But, the Church, of which you are the head, is the largest, its adherents are the most obedient to your call. A sixteen-word order would bring it to pass. Einstein—a Jew and a German—is bright enough to show how it can be done. *Just refuse military service.* Ten percent of your adherents responding to your order to do so would bring an end to war. We might remind you of certain very honorable precedents in church history, when Christians refused to bear arms. And, our common Lord, Jesus, would doubtless affix his signature of approval to such a sixteen-word order issued from the Vatican! Such an order would shake the world! It would turn the Church—all sections—away from anise and cummin—much ado about little—to weightier matters, such as truth, justice, peace!

You claim to be a chosen spokesman of God! Then, in God's name, abolish war! During the last decade many European rulers have been engaged in highway robbery. Some are of your fold. Why not excommunicate them? Why not say, Thou art the man. Why is it that you and the Archbishop of Canterbury make such ado over the control of birth of children, and remain silent, when for now twenty years the little children of the world by the millions have starved and been butchered more cruelly than by Herod of Jerusalem. Men are everywhere saying, "There is no God." They have lost faith. The editors, the clergy do not lead them to belief. Is it not time for you to speak as a "Voice of God"? The Church can abolish war! This ought you to do, and not leave the other undone!

My second message is

To the President

Recognize Russia! We confess to a leaning toward Herbert Hoover. Several years before he was elected President, Dr. David Starr Jordan told us that he was a coming man. We have great respect for Dr. Jordan's judgment. Jane Addams approved of him. No one seems to doubt his organizing ability, shown especially in the years of the Great Feeding. Then, his mother was a Quaker minister, and he could hardly escape the influences of his early years. He has a good wife—all of which is to the good for a man running true, when in place of responsibility. We have also an old-fashioned idea that when anyone is chosen to be mayor or president it is a good citizen's part to support him as much as possible, as *our* mayor or *our* president. We approve of Herbert Hoover's course in standing by his guns on Prohibition. It seems to us also that he did as well as anyone could do when the inevitable financial smash came upon the land. He has shown remarkable ability in turning, in what was supposed to be his rigid individuality, and seeking to bring about the merging of the big railroads—almost a revolutionary procedure in American life—a step towards the much dreaded "socialism." And with him the end is not yet in going in this direction.

We regard the recognition of Russia one of the major, if not the major, issues in our foreign relations. It has been intimated that Herbert Hoover was not in favor of it. We know not why. With his experience of the Great Feeding his heart would be generously inclined. For over nine years our conviction has been that there never could be peace in the world until the United States recognized Russia. The failure to do so is one of the mysteries of our national life. We refuse to believe any longer that it is a matter of paying debts, since responsible Russian officials have often offered to discuss all questions between the two nations. All the time, our State Department has assumed a stony, unresponsive attitude, which is depressing. After attendance at two sessions of the Fish inquiry it seems inconceivable that any American representatives could be so rude and unfair as the men on that committee. So, we ask the President to *recognize Russia.*

Let us give a few reasons. America stands alone among the great nations in withholding this recognition. Why this peculiarity? Our present position is contrary to American practice and tradition. Why? It cannot be because of dissimilarity of institutions, for we recognize England, with king and nobles; Italy, with king and dictator; Japan, with Mikado and feudal

system. Why single out Russia? . . . No nation on earth can display a cleaner record (in fact, not a tarnish) of friendliness toward America than the record of Russia. England and France and Germany at times have all been ugly. Is there a single instance when the Russian people have been unfriendly toward America? Russia with her 140,000,000 people has been a good neighbor, uniformly. Further, Russia is America's best friend, in prospect. Americans are the best treated tourists in Russia. Has America lost her old sense of gratitude and hospitality? Why?

Now, dear President Hoover, we ask, we even demand to know, what forces are operating in our foreign policy that produce the present unusual situation? We ask why citizens of the type of Mr. Woll, Mr. Easly, Mr. Fish seem to exercise such directing power in our foreign policy? Does not the President know that Russia is one of our best customers? Why use suicidal methods to drive her away? How long would American stand the treatment that she metes out to Russia? As citizens, we warn—this cannot go on forever. Other nations will be glad to take trade, if turned down by America.

The President surely knows that there are 2,000 American technicians (with families) at work in Russia. He certainly knows that trade follows the engineer. And, these are some of our best citizens. Why not try to "protect" them as we do citizens in China, to make their work easier? Why not establish diplomatic relations, along which all influences—trade, art, education—may more easily flow! What is the matter with our government, that she acts so contrary to all the principles of human fellowship—principles on which she has long prided herself? America has almost posed as the champion of world peace! Is it possible to imagine peace among the nations—before America and Russia are friendly? World peace would leap forward many leagues the moment these two nations shook hands, and said, "Let bygones be bygones —come to think about it, we have some faults of our own."

And, now—Mr. President—we ask you to know that you are closing the door in the faces of 140,000,000 people—people with generous dispositions, with notable talent and prospects, with a keen hunger for the best things of life. General Grant, in his trip around the world, said the Russian people were one of the three coming powers of the earth. We are really insulting a noble and great people.

We ask—the time has come when the citizens have a right to demand—what forces have been working now for a decade upon our foreign office, for the pursuit of the present policy. We have searched our minds high and low and can find no good reason. There are only two things left to imagine: Either, that selfish monetary interests close to the foreign office are acting like a magnet to deflect the Ship of State from its true course; or, that some industrial interests outside our land and really hostile to our success, are exercising powerful and sinister influences.

In the interests of world peace, as well as in the interests of America, we call for the recognition of Russia!

Pope of Rome—Abolish war. You can do it. Upon you is the responsibility!

President Hoover—Recognize Russia. You can do it. Speak the word!

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

In a private letter received from India, we read:

> The movement inaugurated by Mahatmaji is progressing very nicely. By now there are over 70,000 people in jail.

A movement that celebrates its progress by the number of its followers it can get into jail might as well be recognized first as last as unconquerable.

Men and women will stand a good deal, but how long will they stand being hungry? This is a question that travels from the slums of New York to the farms of Arkansas, and beyond to the forests of Oregon. What is the answer?

On the streets of many of our cities there stand unemployed men selling apples and occasionally other fruit to eke out a living. In the new census of the unemployed it has been announced that these apple-vendors will be listed as "employed." One more evidence of our will to hide rather than to reveal disagreeable facts!

The day of the alienist progresses, if the Ewald trial in New York is any sign. We used to have alienists to testify that the accused was insane. Now we have alienists to testify that the witnesses against him are insane.

A newspaper cross-word puzzle gives as a definition of "bigotry" the word "sectarian." This puzzle editor, we venture to say, is wiser than he knew. At any rate, there are many perfectly good clergymen and scholars who are not yet ready to recognize the identity of these two words.

Inflated Reputations. (7) Mussolini, the Duce, who men think is a great man because he says so himself.

J. H. H.

Tyranny in Italy

[From Our Special Correspondent]

Two mild, liberty-loving Italians were presented with a Christmas gift of fifteen years' imprisonment by Mussolini's government three days before the holiday celebrating "goodwill towards men."

Our newspapers said little about the trial. We Americans are on the whole not much interested in what goes on abroad unless it affects us personally. Many people honestly think that the stories of Fascist outrages are exaggerations. After all, to be sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment in a so-called civilized country must have involved some grave wrongdoing! Mussolini is a great man. The trains in Italy now run on time and Naples is a deal cleaner and more honest since the advent of fascism. So the average person reasons if he thinks about Italy at all.

Let me run over the facts in this last event which has stirred lovers of freedom inside and outside of Italy. On the week end of December 1, Italy's newly created "cheka" rounded up a number of persons whom they charged with having circulated mimeographed leaflets in which the Fascist regime, especially its financial policies, was criticized. This group had as its motto, "The King, the Pope, and the Army." Among those arrested were three Romans well known to most of the foreigners in Rome because of their hospitality, their knowledge of English and their intelligence. These were Lillian Vernon de Bosis, Renzo Rendi, and Mario Vinciguerra. Mrs. de Bosis is American born, her father having come to Italy as a Methodist missionary. She is a cousin of Dorothy Canfield Fisher and widow of the much honored Italian translator of Shelley. Mrs. de Bosis was one of the first "Romans" whose generous hospitality I enjoyed when we took up our residence in Rome over three years ago. She has brought up six children with a mixture of the finest in both Italian and American traditions, all of whom are distinguished for their fine minds and their integrity. Now she is watching six grandchildren growing up under a regime the ideas of which were antagonistic to her liberal husband and his friends. Her son Lauro, who has distinguished himself in Italian literary circles as a poet and the translator of Fraser's "Golden Bough" into Italian, held a post in New York with the Italo-American society for cultural relations. He was on a boat returning to Italy when he was warned of the arrest of his mother. He admitted in an interview in Paris to being the founder of the little paper which was the excuse for the arrest of his mother. He described it as a harmless little sheet which was simply to record information commonly known in other countries but not published in the censored Fascist press.

Mario Vinciguerra is a young professor, a widower with a small daughter. Renzo Rendi is a journalist well known to the foreign correspondents, for he has long been part-time writer for the Chicago *Daily News,* the New York *Times,* the *Theater Guild Magazine,* and recently Rome correspondent for the New York *Evening Post.* He is a scholarly, serious-minded person, a hard worker, a patriot of the finest type, naturally regretting to see the fine international ideals of so many Italians trampled on and fed castor oil by a cheap chauvinistic policy. With his Swiss wife and three year old twin boys he lived in one of the most modest sections of Rome. He was admittedly not a Fascist. He belonged to no Fascist group and his earning capacities were thus hedged about by all the restrictions which apply in Italy to those who don't possess a Fascist membership card. Even as long as two years ago he was being hounded by spies, though his chief offense was that he did not belong to the party.

Rendi was arrested one evening on his way to the movies with his wife. The police remained in his apartment all night and removed his typewriter and private papers. A pleasant experience for a young mother with two babies. The same week end Mrs. de Bosis, Vincinguerra and four others were taken.

The trial took place December 22. I quote from a personal letter written the day after by a friend who was present throughout the proceedings.

> As I remember the events of yesterday it seems to me that I am dreaming. I cannot forget my American ideas long enough to realize that in Europe they are still sentencing men to prison for fifteen years for having done nothing more than express an opinion of a government policy. . . . As you probably know by now, Renzo Rendi, Mario Vinciguerra and others all confessed to having circulated mimeographed leaflets in which they criticized the regime, particularly the financial policies. As you know they never advocated rebellion in any form and were staunchly against the use of force in breaking the regime. When the case came to trial, however, they were not charged under article 4 of the law for the defense of the state which covers "propaganda" but under the far more severe article 3 which covers the cases of those stirring up rebellion and trying to cause "civil war." "Ridiculous," you will say. Exactly! Everyone in the court was shocked to see the court override the lawyers' pleas completely and to hand out punishment fit for murderers to the two pale-faced, mild-eyed fellows sitting in the iron cage.
>
> Rendi was bitterly struck by the sentence because even the law for the defense of the state, if rightly applied, would not have resulted in his getting more than a five-year sentence. He wept a bit afterward, but only so that I who was right next to him could notice it. He waved with a smile to the rest of his friends as they clamped the chains onto him and led him away for the long stretch!

. . . . .

Mrs. de Bosis, after having petitioned Mussolini that she had been ignorant of the real significance of her actions and had expressed repentance and admiration of the regime, was released. Her statement admitted that the clandestine publication had been initiated by her son Lauro who was not in Italy and that she had simply carried on his work without knowing what she was doing. Of the four other prisoners three were acquitted and one, a school teacher, was given three years.

"The impression of the trial," wrote one London correspondent, "was that a howitzer has been used to kill a wasp and that the real wasp is on the other side of the frontier."

It is impossible for an outsider to say how strong is the movement behind the "National Alliance for Liberty," which was the name of the clandestine leaflet circulated by those arrested in the country which Mussolini claims has the freest press in the world. It may be strong enough to have aroused genuine fear in government circles for, with the general world depression, the great unemployment in Italy and the recent wage reductions made by Mussolini, there is cer-

tainly a dangerous amount of unrest. Did not over 20,000 Italians brave glaciers, shooting at sight, and a thousand other dangers to escape over Swiss and French mountain frontiers this last year alone.

The arrests may have been simply an excuse to "get" certain liberals whom powerful Fascists hated. Finally they may have been simply a "haul" for the new "cheka" eager to create a reputation for themselves.

Whatever was the real reason two fine, intelligent young Italians are behind bars for fifteen of the best years of their lives. What for? For loving their country and mankind too much.

Fascism will have much to answer for when its Judgment Day finally arrives. I venture to believe that its ruthless and unjust treatment of these last two victims will but hasten that day.

DOROTHY WALTON.

War, International Policing, and Disarmament

[A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE LATE CHARLES W. ELIOT AND A PACIFIST IN 1925]

[Note: At a luncheon discussion of the Boston Branch of the Foreign Policy Association in the Copley Plaza hotel early in February, 1925, the late President Charles W. Eliot was one of the speakers. Dealing with the problem of disarmament, he said that he knew of no country that did not deem it necessary to maintain an efficient military force ready for immediate use. A voice was heard from the balcony opposite the speaker: "Denmark." Dr. Eliot paused, put his hand to his ear, and asked: "What's that?" "Denmark," again sounded from the balcony and was repeated by someone who sat near Dr. Eliot. "Oh, Denmark!" said he, and proceeded to say that so small a country was negligible. The voice from the balcony was that of Henry W. Pinkham. Not satisfied by Dr. Eliot's answer he wrote a letter to the venerable President Emeritus of Harvard. Other letters followed. UNITY is happy in being able to print this correspondence at this time when the whole question of disarmament is central in the political discussions of the great nations of the world.—Editor.]

I

Brookline, Mass.,
Feb. 7, 1925.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot,
Dear Sir:

I deeply regret that after you had challenged any one present to name a single country that did not feel it necessary to have a military force ready for immediate activity, you should dismiss Denmark, with slighting remarks, as of no account.

It would have been well had the meeting been reminded at that point that Bethlehem of Judea was not regarded as a place of much importance in the old days. But a great light began to shine there.

It may be a long time before other countries exhibit the courage and common sense to follow Denmark's example. But such failure will not detract from the glory that will be Denmark's as the first government to set the example of complete disarmament.

May I call your attention to the enclosed tract in which Nietzsche, a Saul among the prophets, points out that arming ostensibly for self-defense imputes bad faith to other nations?

Very truly yours,
HENRY W. PINKHAM.

II

Cambridge, Mass.,
10 February 1925.

Dear Sir:

I am quite aware that Denmark has lately made very important contributions to industrial and agricultural progress (see Sir Horace Plunkett's writings) and that her present reduction of her regular army and navy is a wise measure for her people and their government. You observe, however, that Denmark retains a very strong armed police force for use at home. If I remember rightly, I did not say myself that Denmark was of no account. I merely quoted a remark of the German Colonel who was serving as Military Attache at the German Embassy in Washington before we went to war with Germany to the effect that the Netherlands, Denmark, and Scandinavia were of no account as powers or nations to rule the world, although they might fairly be called truth-seeking people.

Nietzsche's remark in the slip you sent me that "the doctrine of the army as a means of self-defense must be abjured as completely as the lust of conquest" is as exaggerated and perverse as most of his writing.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. ELIOT.

III

Brookline, Mass.,
Feb. 14, 1925.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot,
Dear Sir:

I thank you for your note of Feb. 10 in reply to my reference to your remarks concerning Denmark at the recent luncheon of the Foreign Policy Association.

You say that "Denmark retains a very strong armed police force for use at home." I beg leave to ask what that has to do with disarmament, which term is understood to refer to armies and navies. There is no serious questioning of the necessity of policing. Pacifists believe in policing. It is war, i. e., collective homicide, to which we object. Gen. Leonard Wood suggested a difference when he said: "The business of the policeman is to control; the business of the soldier is to kill." Sometimes a policeman kills a criminal and is justified upon investigation by his superiors or by a court, but this is unusual. Sometimes a policeman is killed by a criminal whom he seeks to arrest. But this is infrequent. Policemen have a fair expectation of life, higher than that of coal miners, although not so high as that of college professors and ministers. The police of one municipality never fight the police of a neighboring municipality. Police deal coercively only with criminals, a small fraction of the population in every country—except when premature legislation like our prohibitory law creates a multitude of criminals over night.

War, on the other hand, as Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead has defined it, is "the deliberate organized killing of one group of human beings by another group of human beings." Novikov's brief and accurate "collective homicide" is a sufficient definition. In war there is no distinction between righteous men and criminals. In war good men kill good men; choice youth

from universities kill choice youth from universities; honest, home-loving workingmen kill honest, home-loving workingmen. Each side sincerely accepts the word of its government, supported by the assurance of the university heads and the clergy, that it is fighting for self-defense and the salvation of civilization and the redressing of wrongs and the vindication of the moral law and the demonstration that democracy is superior to autocracy, etc., etc. Great heights of moral enthusiasm are reached in the business of changing strong, promising young men into corpses! Of course, there is only one word for such a procedure and that is *insanity*.

And still this abysmal foolishness is justified by the analogy of policing!

The true analogue of the nation is not the individual but the nation on a small scale, the small territorial unit of population, i. e., the municipality. And municipalities dwell side by side, never dreaming of collective conflict.

I am opposed to war not so much because it is wicked or horrible as because it is so damned foolish. It is irrationality to the utmost, irrationality without stint or limit. I do not mind being a knave, but I refuse to take the part of a super-fool by justifying collective homicide. Franklin was right when he said: "There never was a good war or a bad peace."

To paraphrase Cato: *Censeo bellum esse delendum.* And to destroy war all that is necessary is a modicum of common sense—just a few grains will suffice.

Very truly yours,
HENRY W. PINKHAM.

IV

Cambridge, Mass.,
18 February 1925.

Dear Sir:

Most pacifists and many opponents of the League of Nations object to a strong police force as well as to regular armies and navies. You, it seems, do not. Are not the Government and people of the United States today unwilling to assume any share of the charges of a police force to execute the decisions of the League or the decisions of the International Court? You have a clear conception of the horrors of war as it was conducted in 1918; and I dare say you have informed yourself about the probably greater horrors of the next war; but have you any clear idea of the means and methods of what is called disarmament? Is there a single nation in Europe or America which is prepared to forego the maintenance of a large armed force capable of going to war fully equipped at a week's notice? I can neither see nor hear of any such nation. The real question is—what sort of an army should each nation maintain? My answer is the Swiss sort of army. Do you say no army at all?

I cannot agree with you that to destroy war all that is necessary is "a modicum of common sense—just a few grains will suffice." Franklin's remark that "there never was a good war or a bad peace" was sound, but has no application to the question of today.

May I direct your attention to pages 269-275 of the book called "A Late Harvest" made up by M. A. DeWolfe Howe and published by the Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston, in the spring of 1924.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. ELIOT.

V

Brookline, Mass.,
Feb. 20, 1925.

Dr. Charles W. Eliot.
Dear Sir:

I have been meaning to examine "A Late Harvest" since I saw the announcement of its publication, because of my very great respect for its author. Now I have taken steps to procure a copy and shall read carefully the passage to which you direct my attention.

Meantime, trusting that I do not weary you with too persistent epistolary discussion of the subject in which I am deeply interested, I beg leave to reply to certain things in your letter of the 18th.

It may be, as you say, that "most pacifists object to a strong police force as well as to regular armies and navies," but I never met any such nor do I know of any. My friend and Mentor in pacifism, Rev. Charles F. Dole, believes in policing. So does John Haynes Holmes—to mention two prominent American pacifists. So does Bertrand Russell, one of the foremost pacifists of Europe. I never heard that the Quakers, who have religious scruples against war, have any objection to police.

Perhaps you emphasize the word "strong" in your statement. I suppose any person of common sense would say that a police force should be strong enough to do what is required of it, which varies in different places and times. In Brookline the policemen once each month leave at every house a copy of the "Bulletin" of the Health Department. They leave at each house a notice of each Town Meeting and preceding caucus. At street corners where there is much passing, policemen indicate to drivers and to pedestrians when to go. Quelling disturbances of the peace, arresting or searching for criminals, is much the smaller part of the work done by the Brookline Police Department. Doubtless in certain cities the police use a larger share of their time in dealing with criminals than they do in Brookline. But in every city and town in this country a large part of the work done by the police would need to be done if all the people were as well meaning as Jesus Christ. How large a police force should be in any given locality depends on the amount of social service that the police are expected to furnish and on the character of the population concerned. The police force should be strong enough to do its job well. I do not know of any pacifist who would object to that statement.

I repeat my question in a former letter. What has all this to do with war, or with armies and navies?

You ask if the Government and people of the United States are not today "unwilling to assume any share of the charges of a police force to execute the decisions of the League or the decisions of the International Court." I answer that our people are unwilling to promise to fulfil the sanctions provided in the Covenant of the League—restated more specifically in the recent Protocol—such sanctions requiring on occasion military and naval operations as well as an economic boycott. That is to say, we are not wiling to pedge ourseves to engage in *war* in some future contingency, the decision in regard to it resting, in part at least, with other nations. When the contingency appears, we shall decide for ourselves what we shall do.

Such I understand to be the objection to the

League on the part of our "Irreconcilables," which on the whole our people support.

I am in favor of joining the League because I think international periodic conferences and international cooperation are so valuable, and also because I am convinced that the Covenant sanctions are and will be a dead letter. "Dead as a door nail," said Professor Manley Hudson to me of them, in confirmation of my opinion. But as long as those sanctions remain in the Covenant they will be a danger as well as a stumbling block—chiefly the latter. They ought to be cut out by a surgical operation, as Senator Pepper has said, being the vermiform appendix of the Covenant.

Because we are unwilling to promise to go to *war* at some future time in a situation that cannot possibly be foreseen in all its elements, you say that we are "unwilling to assume any share of the charges of a police force to execute the decisions of the League," etc. Here is the fallacy, the confusion, which I am attacking. *The coercion of a nation is not policing but war.* Armies and navies are not changed in their function by dubbing them "international police." War is not a bit more respectable when tagged as "international policing."

Here is the vital distinction in this connection, as I see it, between war and policing. War deals with nations, entire populations of men, women and children. Policing—in its coercive aspect, which alone is pertinent to this discussion—deals with individual wrongdoers. The police arrest a criminal, put him in jail. The court determines the criminal's fate. But the criminal's wife and children are not starved to death! His neighbors are not imprisoned with the criminal! In war, however, no distinction is made between the innocent and the guilty. War involves a whole population in disaster. The little children are among the heaviest sufferers, though certainly entirely innocent.

This distinction was clearly seen by the wise fathers who gave us our Constitution. They saw that a State as such is not properly, not reasonably, subject to coercion.[1] Hamilton and Madison and Oliver Ellsworth maintained that the coercion of a State by the general government would be war, which would involve —said Ellsworth—the innocent and the guilty in a common disaster. Therefore, in the Constitution—Bryce dwells particularly on this matter—there is no provision for the coercion of a State by the general government,—but individuals within a State may be coerced, a very different thing. An individual not only has responsibility which cannot be imputed to an entire population—Burke said, "I do not know how to indict a whole people"—but an individual has a physical body which can be seized, jailed, hanged by the neck. A nation has no such physical embodiment.

Therefore "international policing" is a misleading term to which no practicable procedure corresponds. One might as well speak of intercollegiate flogging! Individual students in colleges may be flogged. But a college as such cannot be flogged! It has no skin that can be stung or broken by the lash. Similarly it is impossible to *police* the nations by the use of armies and navies. An army can proceed to fight the army of another nation, the soldiers can kill one another off, approximately life for life, little children and their mothers may be starved by a blockade, the products of many years' labor may be destroyed in a few hours, engulfing waves of hatred may be flooded on human hearts—but in the name of clear thinking, don't call this insane procedure "international policing"!

Every self-respecting policeman has a right to protest against the insult hurled at him when war is called international policing.

There could be what might properly be called world policing. But it would not make use of armies and navies. Just as in our country federal officers run down counterfeiters, smugglers, and such offenders, disregarding State lines, so there might be world police with police authority to arrest certain wrongdoers in whatever nation such wrongdoers might be found. Such world policemen would be recognized in every country, even as a U. S. marshal's authority is recognized by local police who cooperate with him in catching counterfeiters if the situation calls for such cooperation. Some time there may be world money, and counterfeiters thereof, with world police to run them down. But that is in the future.

I enclose Senator Borah's resolution of Feb., 1923, calling attention to the marked passages! There has been no need in our country, a union of "free and independent states," of "enforcing" the decisions of our Supreme Court in controversies between the States. Similarly, the decisions of an international court must depend for their fulfilment on the reasonableness and justice of those decisions and the force of enlightened world public opinion. Whatever the difficulty, war, to correct it, is the dictate of folly. It is foolish to commit suicide in order to get rid of even smallpox! Better let the smallpox run on a while.

Imagine our Constitution cluttered up with sanctions like those that burden and disfigure the Covenant of the League of Nations! An international covenant should provide for the settlement of all international disputes and then should *take good faith for granted.* Such is the dictate of modern pedagogy, if I am not mistaken. Does the wise teacher take great pains to prescribe penalties and define crimes? Does the wise mother warn her children not to put beans up their noses?

The way to disarm is to disarm.

You ask if there is "a single nation in Europe or America which is prepared to forego the maintenance of a large armed force capable of going to war fully equipped at a week's notice." Certainly. There is Denmark. And Sweden is a close second. Denmark's proposed police force would not be worth anything in war with a nation equipped with modern machines for wholesale killing. The same is true of the Swiss riflemen. Modern artillery could kill them all before they even got a glimpse of the enemy.

Luxemburg had no army when the World War began. Her territory was neutralized by international treaties as was the case with Belgium. Belgium maintained a large standing army, in proportion to its size, and built fortresses and entered into military "conversations" with France and England. What happened? Luxemburg was marched over at will by the German soldiers, against the protest of the Duchess and her government. But the damage done was paid for, not one life was lost, not one atrocity was reported from that little country. Belgium's government, putting something called "national honor" above the welfare,

1. "Whereas, in our Constitutional Convention of 1787, it was successfully contended by Madison and Hamilton that the use of force when applied to people collectively, that is, to states or nations, was unsound in principle," etc.

even the lives, of the people, resisted the Germans who sought transit across the country, and suffered the loss of many precious, irreplaceable lives. Which country showed more common sense, Belgium or Luxemburg?

"Dying that the country might live"—is sheer bunk. Let us apply Kant's criterion of morality to it. Suppose all the people of a country should die that the country might live—would the country live? Not so as to be noticed! A country lives in the minds and hearts of its living citizens, not in corpses. If nine-tenths of a population should die that their country might live, it would be relatively a poor sort of country that would survive. Let those who prate how admirable it is to die for a country specify how large a fraction of a country's population may so die advantageously to the nation, for evidently there is a limit. The limit established, it will be well to inquire whether there can be any certainty that it will not be exceeded in the passion war engenders.

If Franklin's remark that "there never was a good war or a bad peace" was "sound," as you say, why has it "no application to the question today?" War is essentially what it was in Franklin's time, namely, *collective homicide,* the business of changing able-bodied, promising young men into corpses and cripples. But today war affects entire populations as it did not in Franklin's time, and modern scientific methods of wholesale killing are so effective that war is vastly more ruinous than in Franklin's time. One might with some show of reason say that Franklin was wrong since there have been good wars; that is, wars that produced a net benefit in the past, although there never can be *another* good war involving civilized nations.

I call a "modicum of common sense" enough to perceive the fact that, generally speaking—I admit individual exceptions—a *living human being is preferable to a corpse.* That is the *bottom fact* in the whole matter. War is precisely the wholesale transformation of living human beings into corpses. Its logical outcome, which would not be long in arriving were war by modern methods widespread, would be the suicide of the race. Were war universal, this earth would be hell in the process of self-destruction.

It seems not improbable that war will have to stop because so many people in the potentially belligerent countries are seeing its abysmal foolishness and are saying that they personally will never participate in or support a war, be it called "defensive," or "a war to end war," or "a war to make the word safe for democracy," or whatever other lying euphemism may be employed. Ninety American Unitarian ministers have taken that position, which shows which way the wind is blowing.

Ceterum censeo bellum esse delendum.

Begging pardon one thousand times for the length of this letter.

Very truly yours,
HENRY W. PINKHAM.

VI

Cambridge, Mass.,
23 February 1925

Dear Sir:

I have read carefully the whole of your letter of February 20th and have come to the conclusion that our minds work so differently, both in the selection of premises and in the drawing of inferences, that it is useless to continue our discussion.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Tramps

Their faces are blurred with living,
  Like hills obscured by rain;
They rise in the morning, early,
  From corners where they have lain
Beside the traveled highway
  Or empty shacks in town,
Before starched wives can shame them,
  Or hustling husbands frown.

They roll their meager bedding
  Then stare at weeds they have pressed,
And twitch their clothes around them,
  And scowl, and have had their rest.
They take the road: where timber
  Stands vigorous under flood,
And slopes man has denuded
  Are gravel and gullied mud.

GRACE STONE COATES

The Merry-Go-Round

Where the fires of mills are sooty, and the smoke of mills is black,
A worker halts or stumbles, and atones with a broken back.
And the mill-fires still go rumbling, and the owners breathe success,
And the wheels revolve and rattle—for what is one worker less?

Where the crowded streets are playgrounds, a motor is flashing by,
And a woman screams in anguish at an infant's gasping cry.
And ever the crowded playgrounds echo with new distress,
And the wheels revolve and rattle—for what is one infant less?

Where the blue of May is cloudless, and the flowering fields are green,
Legions go marching, marching, stiff as a steel machine.
And the fields are crimson-coated, and the writhing storm-waves press,
And the wheels revolve and rattle—for what is one army less?

Where the fates are seated watching in a sunset-misted land,
A voice may rise from the darkness, "Why hinder the blood-red hand?
At last no tongue will murmur, no wrong be left to redress;
Let the wheels revolve and rattle—for what is one race the less?"

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Civilization

One man craves a scarf or glove,
  And another man must die,
For such is the rule of light and love
  That our lives are guided by.

One man craves a jeweled cross,
  And another hangs thereon.
And the watching world feels less remorse
  Than the winner feels of scorn.

One man barters, one man buys
  Spirit and blood and breath.
And the market groans with new supplies
  Though the stalls be cleared by death.

One man craves a scarf or glove,
  And another man must die.
For such is the rule of light and love
  That the ages sanctify.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English]

XLI

1

And when they were come to the place, which is called Calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left. Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.—*Luke XXIII, 33, 34.*

If only we said the same thing, even though not when people crucify us, at least when they cause us small annoyances.

2

In order to dwell in love with all men, one must not hold dear the felicities of the body, which many people cannot have at the same time, but one must place his life in the spiritual, in that which all men can have at the same time.

3

A man offended you, you were angry at him. The thing is over. But anger against this man has settled down in your heart, and when you think of him, you are angry. It is as if the devil, who always stands at the door of your heart, took advantage of the hour when you felt anger toward a man and opened it, to leap into your heart and sit in it as master.

4

We say: I lost my wife, my husband, my father—when they are dead. But often and often it happens that we lose people who are not dead. We lose them when we cease to be united with them, and then they are worse than dead for us. Often, on the contrary, it happens that we only find people whom we have lost, when they die. After their death we draw near to them. It is of all things most precious not to lose people in life.

5

Robberies, murders, executions are not horrible. What are robberies? They are the passing over of property from one set of people to another. This always has been and will be; and there is nothing dreadful in it. What are executions, murders? They are the passing over of men from life to death. This passing has always been, it is and will be, and there is nothing dreadful in it. Robberies and murders are not dreadful, but the feelings of those men who hate each other, who rob and murder, are dreadful,—the hatred of men is dreadful.

XLII

1

A man counts himself better than other men only because he cannot understand their worth.

2

The more self-satisfied a man is, the less there is in him to be satisfied with.

3

A proud man directs all the forces of his mind towards assuring himself that he is better than other men. But this cannot be true, and therefore the prouder a man, the falser he is.

4

No man can count himself cleverer, kinder, better than others inasmuch as no one can know either the mind, or the kindness or all the virtues of others.

5

It sometimes happens that just because a man feels that all he does is bad, he assures himself that all he does is good.

6

Only men who lead the life of the body alone can consider people as unequal among themselves, some superior, others inferior. If a man leads a spiritual life, there can be no inequality for him.

7

Inequality is so necessary to men who lead the life of the body, that it is not enough for them to recognize the inequality of man with man; they have also invented inequality of families, of nations, of faiths.

8

Inequality is incompatible with love. Love is only love when, like the rays of the sun, it falls equally on all that comes beneath its rays. But when it can turn to one and exclude another, this is proof that it is no longer love, but only something like it.

XLIII

1

It is dangerous to live for the sake of human glorification. You can do much wrong for your own sake, but for the sake of human glorification it is possible to do what is a hundred, a thousand times worse than all that you can do for your own sake.

2

It is difficult to determine whether you serve men for the sake of the soul, of God, or for the sake of men, and their praise. There is one test: ask yourself, would you do the same thing if you knew beforehand that no one would ever find out about it? If you know this, and nevertheless will act, then you are surely doing what you do for the sake of the soul, of God.

3

It is difficult to rid oneself entirely of concern for human glory. To desire it is the same as to desire love from men, and the love of men cannot fail to give joy. Only one must not compromise with the demands of conscience for its sake.

4

Learn to be indifferent to false judgments of yourself. Without such indifference man cannot be free.

5

The majority of sins grow weaker with the years; but with this sin of vanity, you must struggle incessantly from childhood to old age. It is most obstinate of all.

6

When you have been serving men with enthusiasm, it often happens that disillusionment suddenly sets in. Why is this? Only because you served men not for the sake of God, of the soul, but for the sake of human glory. And if there is no glory, no praise, then—disillusionment.

7

A man can never be praised by everyone. If he is good, evil men will find evil in him, and either laugh at him or criticize him. If he is evil, good men will not approve of him. In order that everyone

should praise a man, he would have to pretend to be good before good men, and bad before bad men. But then they would both find out his pretense, and both would despise him. There is only one remedy; to be good, and not to bother about the opinion of others; to seek reward for your life, not in the opinions of men but in yourself.

8

How strange people are, it would seem, who live, not for the felicity of other men, not for their own felicity, but only for the praise of men. And yet how few there are who do not value strangers' approval of their actions more than the approval of their own conscience. (*To be continued*)

The Study Table

Unemployment

It is too bad that such books as this* must be written. Since they are necessary, this is a good job, well done. How unjust is the indictment implied in the title is tragically demonstrated in the text.

The book drips with sob stuff. One comes out of the reading with such jaded emotions that it is a question how far any conclusions reached can register. The author has evidently rifled the case study files of numerous welfare agencies. The book supplies mountain-high evidence that the case work method is no problem solver. The author fails to mention the fact which may be assumed that at the bottom of most of the records cited the all too familiar legend is inscribed "Client refused to cooperate; case closed." Our welfare agencies have reason to abandon such cases. Their technique offers little or no hope where the unemployment scourge strikes. Since the conclusions of the book are largely negative, the author might have more forcefully brought out the negative revelation that our present methods of conducting social service are not the way to cure this or any other social malady which runs deep into the social body.

The chapter of the book headed "Conclusions" is probably the shortest in the entire volume. The net result is that our American society has not found the way to grapple with unemployment. The author concludes that "the problem is intricate. Figures are uncertain. But the facts of unemployment are inescapable. To underline them seems unnecessary—physical suffering, broken spirits, defeated plans, abandoned enterprises, thwarted childhood, and a future left bleak and empty. Where can we take hold if we would help meet the need which these family records make so clear?"

This last question is indeed a poser. It proves too difficult for the author of this book as it has for most of those who have preceded him in an analysis of the problem.

On a later page the author says that

> over and beyond the need for industrial regularization, the need for public works and for a Federal employment system, there is the need for some form of protection against what would seem to be unpreventable unemployment. For there are certain situations in which it is hard to fix the blame.

An immediately following paragraph exposes a serious lack in our present social mechanism.

> Clearly whether unemployment is controllable or uncontrollable its ultimate burden falls upon men least able to bear it and frequently upon those in no way responsible for its incidence. Most of the great modern nations have provided their workers with some form of insurance against such unemployment. We have not.

Not many run the philosophy of unemployment insurance out to its legitimate conclusions. It is assumed that its chief value is that it puts cash into the hands of the worker after the mischief had been wrought and he had been deprived of a job. This does not exhaust its deeper significance. Perhaps few of its friends realize its ultimate import. Certainly its opponents would stiffen their resistance if they realized what the policy comes to finally in social reconstruction.

Unemployment insurance offers one means of correcting the recklessness of our present program of labor exploitation. We theoretically maintain a society in which there is unlimited freedom of economic opportunity. As a matter of fact we have little such freedom. The great mass of people whether limited by our educational facilities, by the close congestion of our population or by whatever other causes, are deprived of the pioneer's freedom to carve out the economic destiny which was the pride of early American society. We are building a different kind of civilization from that of the fathers. The sooner we learn that the old *laissez-faire* methods are outworn the sooner we will construct a social order in which human happiness and not human misery is the rule.

The author of this book does not lay sufficiently strong emphasis upon the final and inescapable responsibility of the *entrepreneur*. It is a fearsome thing to employ a fellow human being. The risks to the employer, the risks to the employee, the risks to the society of which each is a part are all far more serious than our present social regulations reckon. To afford the exploiter of human labor full protection under the law so long as his enterprise serves his own interests and with equal assurance protect him in evading responsibility when his mismanagement wrecks his enterprise,—this is not the way of justice nor does it make for the good society. Few realize how abject is the dependence of the employee upon the caprices of the employer. Liberty to make or mar one's own destiny was the glory of our pioneer civilization. The employer's freedom to make or mar the lives of fellow-citizens whom he employs is another matter. It cannot be left so slightly restricted and so replete with social hazards as now in our American economy.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

*"Some Folks Won't Work," by Clinch Calkins. Published by Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Rebel Poets

It was my privilege last year to review for UNITY "Unrest," the first anthology issued by The Rebel Poets, the Internationale of Song, the splendid success of which has led to the new and totally different collection of 1930.

This collection* arouses more than ordinary enthusiasm. I venture the unqualified statement that the present "Unrest" sets the highest standard of any

*Unrest, the Rebel Poets Anthology, edited by Ralph Cheyney and Jack Conroy. Published by "Studies" Publications, Braithwaite and Miller, Ltd., London, England. $1.00. Purchasable through Hugh Hanley, 224 West Pacemont Road, Columbus, Ohio.

volume (with the possible exception of "The Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry") of social vision poetry I know, not only in the excellence of the individual poems themselves, but in the zeal, the ardor, the flame of burning protest that glows through its one hundred fiery pages.

The brilliant preface by the editors and Clement Wood's magnificent poem on Russia are in themselves worth the dollar charged for the book. Among other high peaks are "The Starred Mother" by Robert Whitaker, "Merrill Root's "Strength of Adam," Jack Conroy's "Dusky Answer," and Frederic Cover's "Puppet Show" from *Contemporary Vision.*

Among other poets known to readers of UNITY and ably represented here are Angela Morgan, Kenneth W. Porter, Marion Doyle, and Lillith Lorraine. UNITY is represented with the quotation of five poems.

Other well known names, such as Charles Erskine Scott Wood, James Rorty, Bert Cooksley, Charles A. Wagner, Louis Ginsberg, and Mary Craig Sinclair, sparkle through the book.

Here are poems which, to quote Ralph Cheyney's "You Cannot Kill the Troubadours," "stick like a lance in your breast." I can think of no better way to pierce the apathy of the American people and their indifference to injustice and to economic exploitation than by a volume like this. The arts alone can kindle the imagination, the sympathy, the passion necessary to achieve the revolution of the spirit which alone can set men free. To this end the Rebel Poets are blazing a glorious trail. More strength and more honor to them!

LUCIA TRENT.

Correspondence

God and Civilization

Editor of UNITY:

In an editorial in UNITY of January 5 you say, "We are living the same old way in the same old world—tinkering with the same old economic system, trusting in the same old armament security, cherishing the same old superstitions and selfishness—and thus moving on swiftly to the same old doom."

A stream can flow no higher than its source, neither can a civilization rise higher than the god it worships.

A bishop of the M. E. Church said recently, "that we had better churches, better ministers, and better choirs with better equipment than we ever had and yet we had traveled as high as we could go till we discovered a new incentive." We do not have to read very far in history before we discover that as man has advanced in his conception of the Deity so he has advanced in civilization. If that is true we must discover a better God. Bishop Blake of the M. E. Church said "Never since Christ was born was there such a hunger and thirst after his Kingdom as today. The world is groping blindly after light and life.

Frederick Myers said "If I had but one question to ask of the Sphinx it would be 'Is love at the heart of the universe.'" Christ told us of a great love that was at the heart of the universe and lived a life of love even to the end, to show his trust in that love, and told us to call that love, Father.

Dr. William Lyon Phelps said the one question for theology to solve was "Is God as good as Jesus Christ." Christ said, "The Father and I are one. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

There is a vast difference between the God that Christ told us of and the God of the churches. The God of the church is but little better if any than the Hindu god.

The God of the churches is a class god. It is "God's Book," "God's day," "God's people" and "God's church." The church people are all in a class by themselves, and by inference the rest are the devil's.

The God that Christ told us about was Our Father and we are his children and no matter how far I wander, even into hell, I am still his child and nothing can break that relationship. I can break the intercourse and I am as near to the heart of God as the so-called saint. The church places the reconcilation to God first. Christ said, "Go first be reconciled to thy brother." "If you cannot love your brother whom ye can see how can you love God whom you cannot see." "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these my brethren ye did it unto me."

In order to have a better world we must discover a better God. Kagawa says, "If a man sees God he can never go out to kill."

Christ told us of such a God but we do not believe in him yet, we still crucify him. Christ was an agnostic in his day and age—he did not believe in an orthodox God, and so they crucified him.

Howell, Michigan JOHN T. RICKETT

True But Not the Whole Truth

Editor of UNITY:

The visitor to Santa Barbara, California, who saw children of every race on earth in one of the public schools, together in their classes, and playing together, (UNITY issue Dec. 8) perhaps does not know that that is the rule all over California, from north to south, and that it is by no means confined to Santa Barbara. There are, it is true, exceptions, but these are exceptions. Such, for instance, as San Francisco, which, I understand, has separate schools for Orientals. The state has also established, as an experiment, a number of special schools for Mexican children, many of whom are migratory. The needs and the lacks of such children are often very different from those of the average child. These, generally speaking, have been successful in proportion to the support, financial and moral, given by the local community and school authorities. But California, as a state, knows no segregation of children in her schools, and her school system ranks high.

Santa Barbara, California ALICE HENRY

Equal Freedom

Editor of UNITY:

I note the review by Taraknath Das of Warren S. Thompson's book, "Danger Spots in World Population." The customs of so fixing prices that a price is put on what is not human work is what causes persons, whether as individuals, private or public groups, to close territories to other persons. The logic of Thompson's ideas, as set forth in the quotations, it seems to me, require the establishment of equal freedom throughout the world; then no governments would exist to colonize any place, but only individuals, singly or in voluntary groups, could locate themselves anywhere upon the earth where climatic and other conditions pleased them or fitted their physical and mental powers, and there was land not occupied by others—either privately or as a part of a highway-park system. Hour-for-hour exchange of adult human work is essential to such equality of freedom. Also, folk must cease to impute inferiority to folk of another color.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW

Hard Winter

The trees are bare,
And the grass is dead;
In the lake by the laurels
Wild birds are fed.
Geese dive for loaves
Of white bread and brown
While men go hungry
In the windswept town;
Birds have bread,
While in Yamhill Street
A bearded old man
Wears sacks on his feet,
And hunts in the gutter
For scraps to eat.

PHYLLIS B. MORDEN.

(*Continued from Page* 322)

live in exile abroad and cannot return to their homes. All administrative talent is killed, and the masses have to be satisfied with petty village offices and clerkships.

"Culturally, the system of education has torn us from our moorings and our training has made us hug the very chains that bind us.

"Spiritually, compulsory disarmament has made us unmanly, and the presence of an alien army of occupation, employed with deadly effect to crush in us the spirit of resistance, has made us think that we cannot look after ourselves or put up a defense against foreign aggression, or even defend our homes and families from the attacks of thieves, robbers and miscreants.

"We hold it to be a crime against man and God to submit any longer to a rule that has caused this fourfold disaster to our country. We recognize, however, that the most effective way of gaining our freedom is not through violence. We will therefore prepare ourselves by withdrawing, so far as we can, all voluntary association with the British government, and will prepare for Civil Disobedience, including non-payment of taxes. We are convinced that if we can but withdraw our voluntary help and stop payment of taxes without doing violence, even under provocation, the end of this inhuman rule is assured. We therefore hereby solemnly resolve to carry out the Congress instructions issued from time to time for the purpose of establishing Purna Swaraj."

Prepared by Mahatma Gandhi, officially proclaimed by Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, President of the All-India National Congress, adopted by the People of India.

Educators Denounce Increase in Lynchings

Twenty-nine southern educators issued yesterday through the Fellowship of Reconciliation, 383 Bible House, Astor Place, a manifesto on lynching, asserting that such crimes trebled in 1930.

"Lynching is more than a crime," the manifesto says. "It boldly thwarts the most elementary ends of justice, constitutes a complete denial of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and represents anarchy in its most vicious and insolent form. It flagrantly strikes at the foundations of all organized social life and outrages every ideal of liberty.

"Although in recent years the number of lynchings has been diminishing, this year has seen a resurgence of this unspeakably brutal thing and an increase in the number of instances where offenders have been unwilling or unable to protect alleged criminals from mob murder. . . . We call upon press, pulpit and school and every patriotic citizen to assist in arousing a resolute public opinion that will uphold the protecting arm of common justice, and we insist upon the prosecution of every person who participates in any act of lynching and of every officer who in any manner condones it."

The signers of the manifesto were:

Albert E. Barnett, Scarritt College.
Luanna J. Bowles, Fisk University.
Thomas Elsa Jones, president Fisk University.
J. L. Kesler, Vanderbilt University.
John Knox, Fisk University.
J. J. Mullowney, president Meharry Medical College.
Mrs. Alva Taylor, Nashville.
Howard Kester, Vanderbilt University.
Wilson Newman, Nashville.
George Hay, Medina, Texas.
Frank Onderdonk, San Antonio, Texas.
A. B. Clarke, Hopewell, Va.
Ida Sitler, Hollins College, Va.
Professor Joe Connally, Paine College, Augusta, Ga.
B. E. Mays, Atlanta.
H. W. Pope, Atlanta.
Howard Thurman, Atlanta.
Hazel North Carter, Columbus, Ga.
Paul Harris, Louisville.
G. Barrett Rich, Lebanon, Ky.
L. H. King, New Orleans.
Elisabeth Gilman, Baltimore.
Fern Babcock, St. Louis.
J. H. Horstmann, St. Louis.
Charles A. Ellwood, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
Elbert Russell, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
C. H. Hamlin, Wilson, N. C.
Wilhelmina Hydrick, Durham, N. C.
Stan R. Pier, Stillwater, Okla.

A New Co-Operative Settlement

We are glad to be able to report that the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Soviet Republic has allowed many of our Tolstoyan friends to form their own co-operative colony in Western Siberia. Some thirty Tolstoyans from Chestakovka and Stalingrad have already started the colony in Kusnetzk and there is another party expected from the Ural immediately. It is anticipated that about 200 families from different parts of the Soviet Republic will soon be able to settle in the locality. They have already been allocated ground for mowing so as to provide forage for the cattle. They are living in loam huts and the forerunners are finding much work to be done in preparing for the large numbers who are expected at the settlement.

The Government have given special facilities for transfer and it is understood that these Tolstoyans will be exempted from military service and taxes for several years. Objection to compulsory alternative civil service is taken by most Tolstoyans, but it is hoped that this question may not be raised for some time. They are promised that they will be allowed to organize their collective farm in accordance with their own convictions.

Kusnetzk is a small town in Western Siberia, near the Altaj Mountains. It is interesting to recall that one of our council members, Valentin Bulgakov, Leo Tolstoy's last secretary, was born in this town.

Other comrades are still in banishment in "The Great North." Many have fallen a prey to typhus and other diseases. Physically they are weak, but spiritually they are strong.

—*The War Resister*

HERESY: Bishop Brown's Quarterly Lectures for 1930, now complete. Subjects: I The American Race Problem; II The Pope's Crusade Against the Soviet Union; III The Science of Moscow and the Superstition of Rome; IV The Godly Bishops and the Godless Bolsheviks. 10 cents per copy and 25 cents for a full set. Free to radical organizations for sale at meetings and to unemployed workers.

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO.
GALION, OHIO

Be Yourself
A Periodical for Precarious Times

The Glass Hive—An American Group Book

(*ten times the year $2 c20 ea 4th yr*)

Edited by Will Levington Comfort, Box 33 So. Pasadena, California

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876